DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 074 FL 018 428

AUTHOR Berney, Tomi D.; Stern, Lucia
TITLE Eligibility and Programming in Chapter 1 E.S.L. Programs, 1987-88. Evaluation Section Report. End-of-Year Report. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; Class Size; *English (Second Language); High Schools; Language of Instruction; Language Teachers; Program Administration; *Resource Allocation; School Districts; *Second Language Programs; Surveys; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report profiles the utilization of funding by sites implementing Chapter 1/ Pupils with Compensatory Education Needs (PCEN) programs in English as a Second Language (ESL) in New York City schools, based on funding data and a district survey. Data for 83 high schools show that 23% of total allocations for ESL teachers were Chapter 1, 32% were PCEN funds, 40% were from tax levy, and 5% were from other sources. Most Chapter 1 and PCEN funds were used to support ESL teachers and paraprofessionals. Tax-levy funds were fairly evenly distributed among ESL, ESL and bilingual content area, and native language arts teachers. The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment used ESL coordinators' responses on questionnaires to evaluate ESL programs. Responses show that Chapter 1 funds were used to extend rather than add supplemental instruction. Class size was generally in accordance with regulations. Field consultants noted that beginning-level ESL students participated less in class and used less English than did the more advanced students. At the intermediate level and beyond, English predominated as the medium of instruction. Program staff expressed a desire for more flexibility in fund allocation. Specific recommendations for program improvement are made. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EVALUATION SECTION
John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator
June 1989

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
1987-88 END-OF-YEAR REPORT

Eligibility and Programming in Chapter 1 E.S.L. Programs 1987-88

Prepared by
The Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit
Tomi D. Berney, Unit Manager
Lucia Stern, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Dr. Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Dr. Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Dr. Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky

Bernard Mecklowitz
Chancellor

Dr. Dolores M. Fernandez
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction and Development

Dr. Harvey Robins
Deputy Chancellor for Financial Affairs

Joseph J. Saccente
Chief Executive for Operations

Amy Linden
Chief Executive for School Facilities

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws, including Title IX and Section 504, may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office of Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

5/22/89

ELIGIBILITY AND PROGRAMMING IN CHAPTER 1 E.S.L. PROGRAMS*
1987-88

SUMMARY

This report, prepared by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA), provides a profile of the utilization of funding by sites implementing Chapter 1/Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.) programs in English as a Second Language (E.S.L.).

The Division of High Schools (D.H.S.) provided data for 83 high schools. Twenty-three percent of the total number of allocations for E.S.L. teachers were Chapter 1, 32 percent were P.C.E.N., 40 percent were tax-levy, and five percent were from other sources. Most Chapter 1 and P.C.E.N. funds were used to support E.S.L. teachers and paraprofessionals. Tax-levy funds were fairly evenly distributed among E.S.L., E.S.L. and bilingual content area, and Native Language Arts (N.L.A.) teachers.

D.H.S. provided two models with specific formulas for the allocation of funds at different levels of instruction. Academic/comprehensive high schools were to provide at least two periods of Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. instruction in E.S.L. and one period of tax-levy E.S.L. instruction daily to beginning and intermediate level students. Vocational schools and academic/comprehensive high schools (for advanced-level students) were to provide one period of P.C.E.N.-funded E.S.L. and one period of tax-levy E.S.L. instruction daily. Of the sites for which data were available, 29 exceeded the guidelines set forth by D.H.S., six exactly met the guidelines, and 12 fell short of the requirement.

OREA used E.S.L. coordinators' responses on questionnaires to evaluate the E.S.L. programs. Responses to the questionnaires generally showed that Chapter 1 funds were used to extend, rather than add, supplemental instruction to what already existed. Class size was generally in accordance with D.H.S. regulations. Several schools placed recently mainstreamed students who were not quite ready for the mainstream English classes into transitional E.S.L. courses.

OREA field consultants noted that beginning-level E.S.L. students participated less in class and used less English than did students at more advanced levels. At the intermediate level and beyond, English predominated as the language of instruction.

---

*This summary is based on the final evaluation of the "Eligibility and Programming in Chapter 1 E.S.L. Programs 1987-88" prepared by the OREA Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit.

Program staff expressed a desire for more flexibility in the allocation of Chapter 1 funds to meet specific school and student needs.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Study the effects of the expansion of E.S.L. programs, particularly those in vocational/technical high schools and in educational option schools.
- Conduct a study to determine how well different models meet eligible students' needs for English language skill development.
- Examine the relationship, if any, between the length of the E.S.L. student's school day and her/his progress towards graduation.
- Ascertain whether a relationship exists between the number of noncredit (or less than full-credit) classes in which a student is enrolled and the likelihood that the student will drop out.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PROGRAM SUPPORT AND DESIGN	2
	E.S.L. Services for LEP Students	2
	E.S.L. Program Models	3
	Model A	3
	Model B	3
	Modifications	4
	Organization and Staff	4
III.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	5
	Sample	5
	Staff	5
	Data Collection	6
IV.	EVALUATION FINDINGS	7
	Responses to Questionnaires	7
	Class Size	8
	Transitional E.S.L.	9
	Respondents' Concerns	10
	Classroom Observations	11
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	12

I. INTRODUCTION

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) annually evaluates the Chapter 1/Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.)-funded English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) Program. Two reports detail the 1987-88 evaluation: OREA's High School Evaluation Unit provides data outcome, overall and by school, for students who participated in the E.S.L. program during 1987-88; and this narrative provides a profile of the utilization of the funding sources to implement this instructional program.

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II looks at regulations concerning the provision of E.S.L. services for LEP students, the two E.S.L. program models, organization and staff. Chapter III addresses staff allocations, funding, a sample, and data collection. Chapter IV describes the responses to the OREA questionnaire, particularly concerning class size, transitional E.S.L., respondents' concerns, and classroom observations. Chapter V offers conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM SUPPORT AND DESIGN

E.S.L. SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS

According to the New York City Board of Education Action Plan for Upgrading, Monitoring, and Management of Programs for LEP Students,* all high schools serving LEP students must provide E.S.L. classes, funded by basic tax-levy monies.** These classes must also follow the mandated New York State Core Curriculum in English as a Second Language. The Board of Education's D.H.S. Memorandum No. 156, dated July 3, 1986, sets forth the following guidelines concerning these tax-levy E.S.L. classes:

> "All high schools must develop and implement tax-levy E.S.L. instruction at the appropriate level (beginning, intermediate, advanced). Tax-levy E.S.L. courses bear English credit towards diploma requirements. Since all students generate a basic tax-levy allocation for English instruction, this model should be implemented at no additional cost."

---

*The Plan (New York City Board of Education, 1986) details the requirements of the ASPIRA Consent Decree and the LAU Plan, Board of Education mandates, and New York State law. It also describes the LEP population and pinpoints ways of upgrading data collection and monitoring efforts in order to improve services to these students. LEP students are those whose home language is other than English and who have scored at or below the twenty-first percentile on the English version of the Language Assessment Battery (LAB).

**Students are entitled to services based on a score at or below the twenty-first percentile on the English language LAB, a standardized test developed by the Board of Education of the City of New York to measure the English language proficiency of non-native speakers of English in order to determine whether their level of English proficiency is sufficient to enable them to participate effectively in classes taught in English.

The memorandum also addressed the distribution of Chapter 1 (federal)/P.C.E.N.(state) categories of funds as applied to high school E.S.L. programs--all LEP pupils must receive instruction in an E.S.L. tax-levy funded class and in at least one supplementary Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. E.S.L. class.

E.S.L. PROGRAM MODELS

There were two models that schools could follow: Model A was specifically for academic/comprehensive high schools; Model B was for vocational high schools; alternative schools could select either of the models.

Model A

This model required that Chapter 1/P.C.E.N.-funded classes supplement the basic tax-levy E.S.L. class, carry a half-unit of elective credit, maintain an active class register of 15 to 20 students, and have an educational assistant. Students enrolled in beginning and intermediate levels were to receive two or three periods of E.S.L. instruction daily and those on the advanced level two periods daily. Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. funding could also be utilized to implement transitional-level E.S.L. instruction.

Model B

This model was intended only for P.C.E.N./E.S.L. and did not include Chapter 1-funded classes. Students received full credit toward graduation; class size was not to exceed 25 students, and classes were not required to have an educational assistant.

Students enrolled in the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels were to receive one period of E.S.L. instruction daily.

Modifications

During the 1987-88 academic year, the requirements of the models underwent modification. The schools had found it difficult to program according to model stipulations; other mandates conflicted with the scheduling requirements; and supplementary E.S.L. classes did not automatically accrue credits toward graduation, slowing students' progress and allowing them few electives.

ORGANIZATION AND STAFF

A designated coordinator at each of the participating schools administered the E.S.L. program. Frequently this individual was the assistant principal (A.P.) of the English department. In schools with large numbers of bilingual students and a Title VII program, the director of the bilingual (Title VII) program may also have been in charge of the E.S.L. program. In some cases, the E.S.L. and bilingual programs were part of a single department and fell under the aegis of the A.P. for that department.

III. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

SAMPLE

The Division of High Schools (D.H.S.) provided data for 83 high schools in the five boroughs of New York City. Seventeen (20 percent) were vocational schools, four (five percent) were alternative high schools, and the remaining 62 schools (75 percent) were academic/comprehensive high schools. In addition to questionnaire data, OREA based its evaluation on an analysis of interviews with the Chapter 1 E.S.L. coordinators in 22 participating high schools and observations of 28 funded E.S.L. classes in 17 of these schools.

STAFF

There were 367.6 allocations for E.S.L. teachers. Of those, 85.2 (23 percent) were Chapter 1, 117 (32 percent) were P.C.E.N., 146.2 (40 percent) were tax-levy, and 19.2 (five percent) were funded by other sources. The teacher/paraprofessional split was very similar in both Chapter 1 and P.C.E.N., with 55 to 60 percent teachers and 35 to 40 percent paraprofessionals. The tax-levy split was different. Of the total number of positions funded by basic tax-levy, 25 percent were E.S.L. teachers, 21 percent were bilingual content area teachers, 16 percent were Native Language Arts (N.L.A.) teachers, and 13 percent were E.S.L. content area teachers.

Ninety-two percent of Chapter 1 funds and 98 percent of P.C.E.N. funds were used to support E.S.L. teachers and

educational assistants or paraprofessionals. Basic tax-levy funds were fairly evenly divided among E.S.L., E.S.L. and bilingual content area teachers, and N.L.A. teachers. Only five percent basic tax-levy money paid for paraprofessionals.

DATA COLLECTION

OREA mailed questionnaires to 104 Chapter 1/P.C.E.N.-eligible high schools. The questionnaire asked E.S.L. coordinators for information on the number of E.S.L. periods each funding source provided weekly (tax-levy, Chapter 1, P.C.E.N., and others) and also asked how many credits students earned.

Of the 70 schools that replied (67 percent), 67 responses were from academic high schools, two from alternative high schools, and one from a vocational high school. OREA was unable to use 23 questionnaires because they were incomplete.

According to the reports of the E.S.L. coordinators, 29 sites exceeded the number of periods of E.S.L. instruction as set forth in the guidelines for Models A and B--P.C.E.N./Chapter 1 accounted for more than two supplementary daily periods of E.S.L. instruction. Twelve sites provided fewer than the prescribed number of periods. Six sites exactly met the models' specifications.

IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES

OREA-developed questionnaires contained questions on class size, on possible complementary foci of Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. E.S.L. and tax-levy classes, on staff development and parent activities, and on student characteristics.

D.H.S., which disburses Chapter 1 funds, wanted to know how these monies were used in relation to tax-levy funds and whether classroom structure, activities, and/or curriculum paralleled the tax-levy program or simply extended it without providing a structure or curriculum distinguishable from the tax-levy program. Therefore, OREA included a question about the coordination of tax-levy and Chapter 1 E.S.L. classes in terms of curriculum and instruction. The following responses give some indication of the ways high schools applied their Chapter 1 funds.

- There is no distinction between Chapter 1 E.S.L. and tax-levy E.S.L. classes (3 responses).
- The curriculum in tax-levy classes complements the curriculum taught in Chapter 1 E.S.L. classes (14 responses).
- Chapter 1 emphasizes oral proficiency (2 responses).
- The two types of classes reflect each other; they are mirror images (2 responses).
- Both tax-levy and Chapter 1 E.S.L. classes provide active and passive knowledge of the language (1 response).

- Tax-levy E.S.L. emphasizes reading, Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. emphasizes writing. They use different texts (2 responses).

- Reading or writing Chapter 1 classes stress the four skills (6 responses).

Regarding coordination between teachers of tax-levy and Chapter 1-funded classes, respondents made the following comments:

- Teachers of Chapter 1 E.S.L. and tax-levy classes coordinate by talking with each other, having meetings, and sometimes grading together.

- The setup is such that teachers should meet to coordinate, but class schedules preclude this.

CLASS SIZE

The regulations governing class size are different for Chapter 1 and tax-levy classes (state regulations specify 34 as the maximum size for tax-levy classes and Chapter 1 regulations specify 20 as the limit). For Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. E.S.L. classes, eight coordinators reported that class size was 15-20; ten reported 20-25; and one reported that tax-levy and Chapter 1 classes were the same size (25-35). For tax-levy classes, three coordinators reported 15-20 in a class; five reported 20-25; and 12 reported 30-35. Many reported that, practically speaking, class size was determined by the number of walk-ins and therefore varied throughout the year, but that an effort was made to program students so as to meet the guidelines for class size.

TRANSITIONAL E.S.L.

Many schools recognized that Chapter 1 funding could play an important role in implementing a transitional E.S.L. class between the most advanced level of E.S.L. and mainstream English. Some sites had already instituted such a class, and D.H.S. was interested in finding out about their experiences. For this reason, OREA included a question on emphasis in Chapter 1 classes.

The academic high schools' transitional classes emphasized more effective sentence structure and patterns, whereas the technical vocational programs emphasized presentation in the job market, interviewing and resume writing, and doing self-evaluations, i.e., assessing one's strengths and weaknesses.

Eight program coordinators responded that advanced E.S.L. classes emphasizing grammar, reading, and writing, were not officially transitional but that many students were mainstreamed from them. Two schools reported that the transitional class readied students for mainstream English by paralleling the curriculum of those classes, using techniques compatible with E.S.L.: oral exercise, a heavy emphasis on the visual, and a lot of writing.

The responses to the question about content and emphasis in transitional classes created the overall impression that there was no consistent pattern but instead adaptatious were made to meet the individual needs of students.

RESPONDENTS' CONCERNS

E.S.L. coordinators, administrators, and teachers expressed a desire for greater flexibility in the ways Chapter 1 funds could be applied. Often the needs of the particular school's E.S.L. program were influenced by the number and range of other programs such as Title VII and community-based organizations (C.B.O.s) as well as by the characteristics of the student population (i.e., whether they were very recent immigrants, came from a junior high school, come from a country with an intact educational system, had their education interrupted by external factors, etcetera). Coordinators felt that schools whose students were Chapter 1-entitled could maximize the effects of these supplemental funds if they had more leeway in determining how they could be spent.

There was general support for the models' guidelines of three periods or more per day of E.S.L. at beginning and intermediate levels for students in regular high school programs and for at least two periods per day at advanced levels and for students in vocational programs.

The application of Chapter 1 funds to transitional E.S.L.; the need for a variety of instructional materials, particularly for semiliterate, illiterate, and transitional students; and the possibility of applying Chapter 1 funds to guidance and other noninstructional services are issues which still must be addresed by the New York City Board of Education's policies.

E.S.L. staff members also had concerns about the ability of

schools to retain overage students (especially those who entered E.S.L. programs in the middle or at the end of their high school careers) or to schedule an adequate number of E.S.L. periods in combination with required and elective courses. These problems were compounded by students' home situations, family responsibilities, and after-school, evening, or weekend jobs that prevented their extending the school day to allow for the extra periods of E.S.L. they were expected to take.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

OREA field consultants observed classes in 17 schools. There appeared to be a tendency for fewer students to participate in beginning Chapter 1 E.S.L. classes than in the more advanced classes. Of the 28 classes observed, only two were small group situations. Class size, as recorded by the observers, fell within the ranges mandated for tax-levy and Chapter 1-funded E.S.L. classes.

Consultants observed that the teachers lectured, explained, and asked and answered questions often but that students rarely asked questions in beginning-level classes.

English was overwhelmingly the language of instruction in the classroom, and it was only in basic-level Chapter 1 E.S.L. (for semiliterate students) and beginning-level Chapter 1 E.S.L. classes that the teacher used native languages to explain or discuss something, usually following unsuccessful initial attempts in English.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

More than half of the 72 schools responding to the OREA questionnaire reported complying with (meeting or exceeding) the D.H.S. models' specifications for numbers of daily E.S.L. classes. There was general approbation for these guidelines. E.S.L. coordinators, administrators, and teachers expressed a desire for greater flexibility in the ways in which Chapter 1 funds could be applied.

E.S.L. staff members suggested that there were a number of items which still required policy decisions by the New York City Board of Education. They were particularly concerned about transitional E.S.L., instructional materials, guidance and other noninstructional services, flexibility in the application of Chapter 1 funds, the retention of overage students, and ways in which to schedule of an adequate number of E.S.L. periods in combination with required and elective courses.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Study the effects of the expansion of E.S.L. programs, particularly those in vocational/technical high schools and in educational option schools.
- Conduct a study to determine how well different models meet eligible students' needs for English language skill development.
- Examine the relationship, if any, between the length of the E.S.L. student's school day and her/his progress towards graduation.

- Ascertain whether a relationship exists between the number of noncredit (or less than full-credit) classes in which a student is enrolled and the likelihood that the student will drop out.